

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Ohio does have the floor.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I suggest—

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, may I inquire how the Senator got the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He got it by unanimous consent.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator asked for unanimous consent to be rerecognized after the Senator from Illinois was recognized in routine morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. STEVENS. As a point of clarification, I want to ask, is there a record of unanimous consent being asked for to recognize the Senator from Ohio at that time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Ohio got the floor. Then he asked unanimous consent that he could yield to Senators who have been carrying on a colloquy without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Is there not a unanimous-consent for a period of routine morning business during which Senators could speak for 5 minutes each? The Senator from New Hampshire was recognized and then the Senator from Illinois under that request.

Will the presiding officer please read the record for the period the request was made?

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I want to assure my friend I do not intend to create a problem, but the fact is I did have unanimous consent—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senate, in response to the question of the Senator from Alaska, at 6:39 p.m., according to the Journal, Senator METZENBAUM received unanimous consent that he yield to Senator PERCY without losing his right to the floor and it was agreed to. There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENS. Very well.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Oregon for their consideration.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 66

Mr. STEVENS. I now ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m. on Monday, June 13, the Senate turn to the consideration of calendar No. 106, S. 66, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, and that there be 13 hours of consideration thereon, including debate on any amendments, motions, appeals, or point of order, if submitted to the Senate, equally divided, to be controlled by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) or their designees.

I further ask unanimous consent that a Commerce Committee modification to the committee amendment and an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) dealing with telecommunications shall be in order; that no other amendments that are not germane shall be in order, with the exception of amendments to be offered by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABNOR), the first dealing with deleting the "two-way" grade communications, the second amendment dealing with insuring that all providers of telecommunications services share in the obligation of providing universal service, and that they be limited to 1 hour equally divided on each.

I also ask unanimous consent that there shall be 30 minutes of debate on any other amendment or debatable motion, appeal, or point of order, if submitted to the Senate, equally divided, and that following the conclusion of the debate the Senate proceed to vote on S. 66 without any intervening debate, motion, appeal, amendment, or point of order.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Objection. Objection.

Mr. BYRD. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. METZENBAUM. Reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the latter portion after "S. 66" was to be dropped from the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PACKWOOD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PACKWOOD. That is correct. Where it says "proceed to vote on S. 66," simply put a period and delete the words "without any intervening debate, motion, appeal, amendment, or point of order."

The reason I had initially put that in the unanimous-consent order is I wanted to make sure when we got to the end of the 12 hours we were not suddenly faced with a plethora of amendments that could not be debated but could be voted on. The Senator from Ohio has assured me that

he has no intention of attempting to filibuster in that fashion.

I have assured him that I have no intention of offering an amendment under these privileges that I am given that is unrelated to the bill. I am not sure if they are technically germane, but I can assure the Senator they are related to the bill. I know the fear he has. The minority leader will recall it well. As I recall, we were considering a public housing bill and one Senator asked to have an amendment offered and it turned out to be a capital punishment amendment.

I have no intention of doing anything of that nature. It will be related to this bill. I will be happy to show it to the Senator from Ohio ahead of time.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, the understanding is that the amendment which the Senator from Oregon is proposing and asking be made germane will be consistent with the general thrust of the legislation?

Mr. PACKWOOD. It will clearly be consistent. It may extend it a bit.

What I am trying to do in this bill, you slay one dragon and two more pop up as we are going along, and I am doing the best I can to harmonize different interests. I may be able to harmonize some and in the process of doing that I might expand the bill a bit to the satisfaction of all the parties, but it technically might not be germane.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I understand. I have no objection.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the provisions of the bill with respect to cable television in cities, at this point, do not have the unanimous, harmonious acceptance of the Nation? And, am I correct that we hope to use this interval to see if we cannot get some agreements that do not now exist, so that even more people will be voting for the bill when the time comes?

Mr. PACKWOOD. I hope so. There was a time when I thought we had a harmonious relationship between cable and the cities, and then a few cities have jumped places, but I am hoping we can bring them all back.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Also, a time certain tends to concentrate the mind, for those of us who are hanging.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Arizona seek to reserve the right to object to this unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I think this is a very sorry turn of events. We have been working nearly 4 years on this piece of legislation. Most of the time has been spent in conference with the mayors and city councils of the various cities around this country. The mayor of New York never asked to come and be heard, yet he has phoned a number of us and asked that this be put off. No one from the State of New Jersey, to

my knowledge, except the distinguished Senator representing New Jersey, has raised any objections to this. The Coalition of Cities, which does not include New York, has sort of worked around this, never raised any objection. The National League of Cities, the largest league of cities in the country, is still unanimously behind this.

So, Mr. President, I am kind of at a loss to know why after all these years we are suddenly going to say no to the American people who want a little better television reception than they can get over antenna-to-antenna.

This is a very sad turn of events, because only the day before we completed work on this bill, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. took it unto themselves to try to shoot this bill down. Why, I do not know. But we have adopted amendments to take care of them and to take care of the various new telephone companies that have sprung up around the country as a result of AT&T's divestiture.

So, Mr. President, here, at the last moment, when the cable people of this country have been waiting, when the American people in New York City and in Washington, D.C., and all over this country have been waiting for decent television reception, we have a handful of Senators, representing a handful of cities, and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., who decide they do not want this bill discussed.

Mr. President, I think patience has been about exhausted among the people who are interested in this bill, and they are mainly the people of this country, not the cable television people.

So, while I know we cannot get this bill up tonight—we have to postpone it until the 13th of next month—I hope that by that time the mayor of New York City will take the time to study this bill and find out what it is all about. Maybe the mayors of other big cities, two or three of them, will take the time to find out what they are talking about when they call here and object.

The objections I have had from those cities have come from labor unions and a handful of people who might lose their jobs if this bill is passed. I do not think so, but they might. But I think this is a sad way to run the affairs of this country.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished acting Republican leader a couple of questions?

Personally, I do not intend to object, and I do not want to object. I notice that the time will be controlled by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hollings) or their designees.

My question is this: Are these Senators both on the same side of the question? If so, it is normal for the minority leader to control the time in oppo-

sition. That does not necessarily mean I am in opposition.

Mr. STEVENS. I say to the Senator that it is a matter of form. If the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Commerce Committee are on the same side, the Senator is correct. As I understand it, he would be in control of the time, if the Senator from South Carolina agreed with the Senator from Oregon. The time would automatically go to the other side.

Mr. BYRD. I would appoint a designee on this side. It is not that I want to control it, but the opposition is entitled to have the time.

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct. Does the Senator wish to add to this agreement that if the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from South Carolina are in agreement, the Senator from West Virginia will control the time?

Mr. BYRD. In opposition. I do that only because it is normal. I may not be in opposition.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I must say that the entire committee approved this bill, with the exception of one member. The ranking minority member, the Senator from South Carolina, is for this legislation. So I think you are going to have trouble finding somebody to take the position you have asked about.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that my unanimous-consent request be so modified, that in the event the two floor managers are in agreement, the time in opposition will be controlled by the minority leader or his designee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, is it also agreed that there will be no votes on Monday?

Mr. STEVENS. It is the intention of the leadership to state that any roll-call votes ordered on amendments or motions relating to S. 66 on Monday will be postponed until Tuesday, for a time to be determined after consultation with those involved in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. BYRD. The time to be determined by the two leaders.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. They will, naturally, work with the managers.

Mr. STEVENS. It will be by the two leaders, after consultation with the managers of the bill, for the votes to occur on Tuesday, the 14th.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. It should be determined by the leader, after consultation with the minority leader.

Mr. STEVENS. That is my understanding. We are not prepared to enter into the agreement as to the time that will occur, so that has not been included in this request. It will be determined by the leader, after proper consultation.

Mr. BYRD. And I will be in charge of the time in opposition.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Which does not mean I am opposed. In the normal course of things, that is the way it is done.

Mr. STEVENS. The Senator's fairness is known.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request, with the modifications proposed?

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank all concerned, particularly the Senator from Ohio and those who have been involved in the negotiations.

The text of the unanimous-consent agreement is as follows:

Ordered, That at 1:00 p.m. on Monday, June 13, 1983, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 66 (Order no. 106), a bill to amend the Communication Act of 1934, and that there be 13 hours of consideration thereon, including debate on any amendments, debatable motion, appeals, or points of order which are submitted or on which the Chair entertains debate, with the time to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Robert C. Byrd), or their designees.

Ordered further, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received, with the following exceptions: a Commerce Committee modification to the committee amendment; an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) dealing with telecommunications; an amendment to be offered by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Abdnor) dealing with deleting the "two-way" grade communication; and an amendment to be offered by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Abdnor) dealing with insuring that all providers of telecommunications services share in the obligation of providing universal service: *Provided*, That there be 1 hour debate on each of the above amendments, with the time to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of such and the manager of the bill.

Ordered further, That there be 30 minutes debate on any other amendment, debatable motion, appeal, or point of order if submitted to the Senate, with the time to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of such and the manager of the bill.

Ordered further, That at the conclusion of the debate, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of S. 66.

TIME AGREEMENT ON S. 639, LEBANON EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1983

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate turns to the consideration of Calendar No. 120, S. 639, a bill to authorize supplemental assistance to aid Lebanon, it be considered under the following time agreement:

One hour on the bill, to be equally divided between the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the ranking minority member, or their designees; that no amendments be in order with the exception of the com-